

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### Specification Objections

The Examiner objects to the phrase "The or each compartment" on page 1 of the application as filed. The specification makes in clear that "A Trusted Device or Trusted Platform Module may include one or more logically protected computing environments ..." Therefor the reference to "the compartment" corresponds to the situation where the Trusted Device or Trusted Platform Module includes only one logically protected computing environment whereas the "each compartment" corresponds to the situation where the Trusted Device or Trusted Platform Module includes more than one logically protected computing environment. As such there is nothing wrong with referring to "The or each compartment".

The Examiner objects to the phrase "preferably the or each security" on page 3 of the application as filed. For reasons which should now be self-evident, there is nothing wrong the phrase "preferably the or each security" on page 3 of the application as filed.

The spelling of "mean s" has been corrected.

The Examiner objects to "www.trustedpc.com" as allegedly being a hyperlink. With all due respect, the Examiner is mistaken. The term is a URL, but it is not a hyperlink. It would need to have "a http:/" prepended to it and inserted between the symbols "<>" to convert it into a hyperlink. Please see MPEP 608.01 VII.

### Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to the phrase "the or each security rule" in claim 3. While the applicant believes that there is nothing improper with using "the or

each" in a claim, claim 3 has been rewritten to in such a way that "rule" is used in its plural form.

Claim 6 is amended to replace "operate" with "operates" as suggested by the Examiner.

The Examiner asserts that "chrooted" is "not a word". That is not a proper grounds for objection. See the discussion below where the rejection under 35 USC § 112 is addressed.

#### Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112.

The Examiner asserts that "chrooted" is "not a word". That is not a proper grounds for rejecting claim 8. First it is believed that "chrooted" is a word, albeit a new word. See the accompanying search done at Reference.com. Those skilled in the art believe it to be a word and they clearly know how to use this new word. Second, 35 USC § 112 does not required that only "proper words" (whatever they might be) appear in claims.

The Examiner notes on page 8 of the official action that "chroot" is a Linux command. The term "chroot" is not limited to Linux.

It is also noted that "chroot" appears in the claims of at least two issued US Patents. See US patents 7,069,275 and 5,903,732.

With respect to claims 11-13, they have been amended to depend from claim 3 instead of claim 1 to supply the missing antecedent.

#### Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite

the system being arranged to load an operating system into said trusted computing platform and thereafter to load onto said trusted computing

platform data defining a predetermined security policy ...

In Wiseman (USP 7,216,369) cited by the Examiner, Wiseman teaches loading of the security policies when the OS is started. See Figures 3A and 3B cited by the Examiner.

The present disclosure mentions that in the prior art it was considered "desirable to load the security rules as early in the startup sequence of a platform as possible, such that relevant security rules are in force as soon as a service or process is started." See paragraph 0008. The problem with this prior art approach is discussed in paragraphs 0009-0011 of the present application.

It is believed that it is very well known that services are started after an OS loads. Claim 1 as originally presented included the recitation "data defining a predetermined security policy defining security attributes to be applied to one or more of the at least one service or process when said service or process is started." The data in Wiseman is not "applied to one or more of the at least one service or process when said service or process is started" as required by claim 1. Indeed, when rejecting claim 1 the Examiner basically equates the term "service or process" with "operating system".

Claim 1 has been amended to make it explicit (rather than merely implicit) that the OS is loaded before the "data defining a predetermined security policy" is loaded.

As such claim 1 clearly defines over Wiseman.

Claim 15 has been amended to read:

"loading an operating system into said trusted computing platform;

after loading the operating system, starting a service or process associated with at least one of the logically protected computing environments; and

controlling the operation of the at least one logically protected environment by applying, upon starting of the service or process, security attributes to the service or process."

With this amendment, loading Wiseman's OS cannot be read upon starting the recited service or process.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2125. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2125.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

August 28, 2007  
(Date of Transmission)

Richard Berg  
(Name of Person Transmitting)

(Signature)

28 August 2007  
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Richard P. Berg  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Reg. No. 28,145  
LADAS & PARRY  
5670 Wilshire Boulevard,  
Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, California 90036  
(323) 934-2300 voice  
(323) 934-0202 facsimile